DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 847 VT 020 241

AUTHOR	Martens, John
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Selection of Disadvantaged Youth in Four Iowa Youth-Work Programs. Part II. Final Report. Research-Evaluation Component of Project I-TRY (Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth).
INSTITUTION	Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Industrial Relations Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Iowa State Manpower Development Council, Des Moines.
PUB DATE	Jul 69
NOTE	74p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth; Employment Opportunities; Employment Programs; Family Background; Family Income; Family Structure; Individual Characteristics; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Summer Programs; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Iowa; *Project Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth; Project ITRY

ABSTRACT

At the urging of the governor of Iowa, private business and industry plus interested citizens organized and funded four Project Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth (Project I-TRY) programs in many Iowa cities during the summers of 1967 and 1968. In assessing the effectiveness of the programs in reaching and selecting disadvantaged youth, analysis was made of: (1) personal and family characteristics of enrollees plus those who applied for employment but were not accepted, and (2) comparisons of family incomes as reported by the Iowa State Department of Revenue with the family income-family size guidelines for the various programs. The results revealed that a large portion of the enrollees in Project I-TRY programs were disadvantaged as indicated by such characteristics as coming from households with over six members and from families receiving welfare payments. The enrollees who were not economically disadvantaged according to the family income-family size guidelines were admitted to the programs because of special circumstances, such as personal, discipline, and family problems. Though 1,100 youth experienced employment, the Project I-TRY and other youth employment programs were inadequate in that many young people in these cities were still unemployed. A related report is available as VT 020 242 in this issue. (SB)

FORM A10 - PRINTED IN U.S.A.

ED 076847

VT020241

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076847

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PART II

An Evaluation of the Selection of Disadvantaged Youth in Four Iowa Youth-Work Programs

by

John Martens, M.S.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1.	Introduction	1
Chapter 2.	Selection of Enrollees for the I-TRY Programs	5
	Tools for the Evaluation of the Selection Processes	7
	Evaluation of the Selection Processes in the Four I-TRY Programs	9
	A Summary of the Characteristics of all I-TRY Participants	45
	An Evaluation of the Reliability of Parental and Enrollee Reports of Income for Use in Screening Applicants	47
	Some Suggestions for the Selection of Disadvantaged Youths for Employment Programs	53
Chapter 3.	Summary and Conclusions	56
Literature Cited		59
Appendix A		64

List of Tables

2.1. Operation Youth Opportunity family income-family size guidelines 10

2.2. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Des Moines Operation Youth Opportunity 12

2.3. Family income as reported by enrollees, parents, and the State Department of Revenue for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity 15

2.4. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Des Moines 17

2.5. Youth Employment Services' family income-family size guidelines 20

2.6. Comparison of reported income with the family income-family size guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services 21

2.7. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services 23

2.8. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services 25

2.9. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Waterloo's MIS program 28

2.10. Family income as reported by the youths not selected and the State Department of Revenue figures for these youths not selected for Waterloo's MIS program 31

2.11. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Waterloo MIS enrollees 33

2.12. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding a family income guideline for Waterloo MIS enrollees 34

2.13. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Davenport Play Corps enrollees 36

2.14. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Davenport Play Corps enrollees 39

2.15. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for the Play Coprs enrollees paid by CPI 40

2.16. Summary of enrollees over the income guidelines by over $300, Department of Revenue figures 41

2.17. Summary of race of all enrollees and those over the income guidelines 42

2.18. Summary of enrollees dropping out of school 42

2.19. Summary of enrollees from households of over six members 43

2.20. Summary of enrollees missing at least one parent 43

2.21. Summary of social class of those enrollees over the income guidelines 44

2.22. Comparison of reported family incomes for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity 48

2.23. Enrollees reported family income minus Department of Revenue reported income 50

Chapter 1

Introduction

Education, training and work experience are for the youth of today the foundation for a productive life. Yet for many youths the future looks very bleak indeed; especially for youths from socially and economically disadvantaged families. Of approximately 26 million youth entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970, 7.5 million or 29.1 percent will have not completed high school (43, p. 7). These youths lack the necessary skills and education for a productive career and many will be unemployable. During May 1968 the unemployed out-of-school youth, ages 16-21, totaled 865,000 or 8.8 percent of this age 16-21 labor force. The unemployment rate among non-white males 16-21 years of age was 15.0 percent. Of the unemployed youth 16-19, forty percent had never held a job (57, No. 12, Table A.3). The lack of previous work experience and lack of education makes it extremely difficult for some youths to find employment.

The prospect for summer employment which gives valuable work experience

and financial help with schooling is non-existent for many teenagers. During June and July of 1968, 1.8 million or 14.0 percent of the youth seeking work were unemployed. Although youth employment increased 450,000 from 1967, unemployment increased 100,000 due to expansion of the teenage labor force. In addition to the unemployed, 1.0 million youths ages 16-21 desired full-time work but could only find part time jobs. The unemployment rate for non-white youth was 26.0 percent (58, No. 2, pp. 6-9; 58, No. 3, p. 5).

Governor Harold E. Hughes of Iowa saw employment for disadvantaged youth as one possible way to lessen the many social problems that caused the civil disorders and riots in many U. S. and Iowa cities during the summer of 1967. Governor Hughes toured Iowa's major cities to encourage private businessmen to provide jobs for youth in their businesses and to provide funds to support local youth-employment programs. Programs were established in many Iowa cities during the summer of 1967 and 1968.

These youth employment programs were not large enough in scope to provide employment for all youths desiring employment in these cities. The response to these employment opportunities was overwhelming. Between 3000-3500 youths applied for the 1,100 jobs.

This report describes the selection methods and criteria in each of these cities and evaluates whether the specified youths were admitted to the programs. This evaluation is important because of the focus of all four programs on the disadvantaged youth. We must know if we are actually able to reach the hardcore disadvantaged.

The data used for analysis of the selection process is the personal and

family characteristics of the program enrollees plus a description of youths who applied but were not accepted for employment. Data on family incomes supplied by the Iowa State Department of Revenue was used to detect whether the enrollees were economically disadvantaged. The reliability of an income guideline for selection of enrollees is evaluated by a comparison of Iowa State Department of Revenue Income figures with the parents reported income. The different selection methods are compared to see which method is most effective in reaching the disadvantaged.

This report is part of a total evaluation of Project I-TRY (Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth). Project I-TRY consisted of locally financed youth-work programs in five major Iowa cities during the summer and school year 1968-1969. Project I-TRY funds were granted to these cities by the Iowa Manpower Development Council to provide ancillary and supportive services to the youths involved. The original grant was from the U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Funds were provided to the Industrial Relations Center of Iowa State University to finance this evaluation.

The other portions of the evaluation are "Governor Harold E. Hughes and Social Crises in Iowa" by James Socknat and an evaluation of the effect of these programs on the youths involved by Neil A. Palomba, Edward B. Jakubauskas, and John Martens. "Appendixes to Accompany the Project I-TRY Evaluation" is the publication containing the statistical data cited in this report. The reader is referred to this publication for more complete statistical data.

This report on a special manpower project was prepared under a contract with the Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Organizations undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

In addition, it should be emphasized that the points of view expressed in the four parts of this evaluation report do not necessarily represent the views of the present state administration of Iowa, former Governor Hughes, or the views of Iowa State University. The authors bear complete responsibility for the research design and the conclusions reached in this study.

Chapter 2

SELECTION OF ENROLLEES FOR THE I-TRY PROGRAMS

The cities which organized youth-work programs in the summer of 1968 had no trouble attracting many eager applicants looking for a way to earn some spending money and looking for activities to fill in the summer days. In all the cities with I-TRY programs, the demand for summer jobs far exceeded the supply. For example, it was estimated by Frank Owens, Youth Employment Specialist for the Iowa State Employment Service, that half of the youths in Des Moines wishing employment during the summer of 1968 did not find a job.[1] Even during periods when the unemployment rate is low for the nation as a whole, teenagers experience extreme difficulty in securing jobs. Some of these problems may result from the minimum hourly wage scales which force employers to pay inexperienced teenagers what the employers consider to be too high of a salary. Another cause is the increase in the size of the teenage labor force. For the nation as a whole nearly 13 million 16 to 21 year-olds were working or seeking employment in the summer of 1968 which was an increase of 550,000 over the summer of 1967. The number of jobs available for this group increased by only 450,000. Approximately 100,000 more youths in this age group were unemployed (58, No. 3, p. 5).

---

[1] Owens, Frank. Des Moines, Iowa. Operation Youth Opportunity data. Private communication. March 1969.

The problem of locating jobs is even more difficult for youths ages 14-15. In addition to being less experienced and mature when competing for scarce jobs with older teenagers, these youths are prevented from working in many types of jobs by Iowa's child labor laws. Even if they are not prevented from working at a particular job by law, many employers put a blanket rejection on applications by younger teenagers because they are not aware of the types of jobs acceptable by law for these youths. About the only jobs available to this group are grass mowing, leaf raking, and other odd jobs.

Because of the tremendous number of youths wanting summer employment, the cities with I-TRY programs had to set up standards and priorities for admission to their problems. In looking at criterions for the selection of enrollees for the Project I-TRY programs, it must be remembered that these programs were financed almost entirely by private funds and that the funding of these programs came about after the riots and civil disorders in the summer of 1967 brought an acute awareness among community leaders of the frustrations of poverty and lack of opportunity among many residents of Iowa's major cities. The contributors to the programs were probably aware that a large portion of the youth in their communities lacked an opportunity for summer employment, but were also aware of the opportunity to avoid possible trouble by economic and racial minority groups in their cities. All the I-TRY programs put a priority on the selection of youth from low-income families and youths who might be considered disadvantaged by other criterions (e.g. police problems, mental problems, family problems, minority group membership, etc.). The general feeling was that these youths had the most difficulty in locating and competing for scarce jobs, had the greatest need for supplementary income, and could receive the most benefit from a work experience. These programs were not welfare programs in that the youths worked for the income they received but the fact that

the programs were financed by private contributions gave them welfare aspects. The programs also concentrated on employment for 14 and 15 year old youth who have the most difficulty finding summer jobs.

Tools for the Evaluation of the Selection Processes

This study will evaluate the selection process in the four cities with I-TRY programs by their own criterion and by measures developed for this evaluation.

The Iowa State Department of Revenue cooperated with the Industrial Relations Center by providing confidential information concerning family incomes for a number of families with youths in the I-TRY programs. Because of difficulties in locating files and non-reporting of income by low-income families, only about twenty percent of the family incomes were located. The figures are adjusted gross family income from the 1967 Iowa State Income Tax forms. In examining this data about incomes, the reader must be reminded that the reported incomes are skewed to the upper income range because of the non-reporting of income by low-income families and families on welfare.

In Des Moines, family income information was made available from the confidential family income reports (Appendix A) completed by the parents of the applicants. This form asked for gross family income from all sources. Unfortunately, income information was not available for all enrollees selected for the Operation Youth Opportunity program. Applicants were required to indicate their family income before they received consideration for employment with Operation Youth Opportunity.

On Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix I) of the I-TRY evaluation, a question was asked program enrollees about family income. The response rate was less than 50 percent on this question, partially because the youths were not aware of their family income and partially because of their refusal to respond.

A two-factor index of social position as developed by Hollingshead (32, pp. 235-237) was used to indicate in which social class the enrollees who exceeded the family income-family size guidelines belonged. This index was a modification of the original three-factor index developed by Hollingshead and Myers (23, pp. 387-397) and correlated .968 with the three-factor index (32, p. 16). The index was based upon educational attainment and occupational status of the family head. Families were separated into five classes from I-V (high to low). The characteristics of families in each class are discussed in Social Class and Mental Illness (23, pp. 66-136). As an example a doctor would fall into social class I while an unskilled factory worker with a ninth grade education would fall into class V, the lower class. An electrician with a high school diploma would fall into class IV and an accountant with a college degree would fall into class III.[1]

An examination was made of certain personal and family characteristics that might indicate an enrollee was disadvantaged. Enrollees not returning to school are disadvantaged by lack of education in competing for jobs. Enrollees from exceptionally large families may be in a greater need of supplementary incomes. Many youths were disadvantaged because of a broken

---

[1]For a more complete description of this index see Myers and Bean (32, pp. 235-238).

home or death of a parent. Many had had or were having problems involving the police. A large number of enrollees were non-white which may put them at a disadvantage in seeking an education and a job.

The term "disadvantaged youth" is hard to define and each program defined it differently. The term has been defined for purposes of this evaluation as a youth who has less chance than a majority of his peers for a successful life.

Evaluation of the Selection Processes in the Four I-TRY Programs

Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity

The Youth Employment Service of the Iowa State Employment Service in Des Moines handled screening, interviewing, and placement for the Community Improvement Inc. Operation Youth Opportunity Program (OYO). The Youth Employment Service also handled applications for the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), Youth Opportunity Campaign (YOC), and other summer employment for youth. Five interviewers determined which program the applicant would fit into, NYC and YOC having the strictest guidelines. If the youth didn't fit into these programs, a check was made to see if he would fit into the OYO program guidelines.

A confidential financial statement (Appendix A) was completed by a parent before the applicant was considered for employment. The statement indicated family size, family income, and whether or not the family was on a welfare program. Table 2.1 shows the OYO family income-family size guideline. OYO could admit youths above the guidelines if special personal or family circumstances warranted this.

Table 2.1. Operation Youth Opportunity family income-family size guidelines[a]

Number of individuals in family	Family yearly gross income level
1	$2,600
2	3,100
3	3,600
4	4,100
5	4,600
6	5,100
6+	For each individual over 6 add $500 to income level

[a]Barr, Ralph. Iowa State Employment Service, Des Moines, Iowa. Data on OYO. Private communication. Nov. 1968.

Some special problems were encountered by Des Moines in the placement of enrollees during June of 1968. There was a shortage of qualified applicants so the guidelines were waived for applicants from Des Moines Technical High School. Many youths over the guidelines were admitted.

A total of 315 youths were placed in the NYC program, 50 in YOC, 600 in OYO, and 190 in non-program jobs in the Des Moines area according to Frank Owens, Youth Employment Specialist with the Iowa State Employment Service.[1] Only 190 placements out of a total placement of 1,155 were in non-program jobs. This gives some idea of the employment gap filled by the OYO program.

Community Improvement Inc. was able to reach a significant number of

[1]Owens, Frank. Iowa State Employment Service, Des Moines, Iowa. Data on OYO. Private communication. March 1969.

disadvantaged youth. Over 125 of the enrollees or almost 25 percent were from families on some type of public assistance. Over 50 percent came from minority groups. Ten percent indicated they would not be returning to school in the fall and 33.5 percent were from households with more than six members. In 44.9 percent of the families the family head had less than a high school education. In 43.4 percent of the families at least one parent was missing or not living at home. Of all enrollees, 89 had had some contact with the Des Moines police before their enrollment in the program. All these figures indicate a significant number of disadvantaged youth were enrolled.[1]

Des Moines also had a significant number of enrollees in their program who may not have been disadvantaged, at least, according to measures available to this evaluation.

Table 2.2 compares the family incomes reported from the parents and the Iowa State Department of Revenue with the family income-family size guidelines in Table 2.1. Family size was determined from Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix I). Fifteen percent of the enrollees exceeded the income guidelines by more than $300 according to their parents reported income to OYO. These youths were admitted to the program despite a knowledge by program officials that they exceeded the guidelines. Four percent exceeded the guidelines by over $1,500 according to the parents' reports,

The second measure used to detect those over the guidelines was the Department of Revenue family income figures from income tax reports. Of incomes located by the Iowa State Department of Revenue, 63.4 percent were

---

[1]For a more complete description of personal and family characteristics, see (67, Questionnaire Appendix I).

Table 2.2. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Des Moines Operation Youth Opportunity.[a]

	Parents report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all parents
Not available	126	-	-	27.8
Below guidelines by				
4500 +	2	.6	.6	.4
2501-4500	26	7.9	8.5	5.7
1501-2500	61	18.6	27.1	13.4
1001-1500	67	20.4	47.5	14.8
601-1000	27	8.2	55.7	5.9
301-600	31	9.5	65.2	6.8
At guidelines	48	14.6	79.8	10.6
Above guidelines by				
301-600	17	5.2	85.0	3.7
601-1000	14	4.3	89.3	3.1
1001-1500	15	4.6	93.9	3.3
1501-2500	7	2.1	96.0	1.5
2501-3500	7	2.1	98.1	1.5
3501-6500	3	.9	99.0	.7
6500 +	3	.9	99.9	.7
Total[c]	454			

[a]Source: Operation Youth Opportunity parents confidential financial forms (Appendix A) and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

[b]The commulative percentage totals may not add to 100.0 percent in this and following tables due to rounding of percentage.

[c]The figures reported in Chapter I I I and 67, Data Appendix A only include those enrollees who completed a questionnaire. The response rate ranged from 70 to 95 percent of the enrollees.

Cum. % of all parents	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of[b] reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
27.8	375	-	-	81.3	81.3
28.2	1	1.2	1.2	.2	81.5
33.9	2	2.3	3.5	.4	81.9
47.3	6	7.3	10.8	1.3	83.2
62.1	6	7.3	18.1	1.3	84.5
68.0	4	4.6	22.7	.9	85.4
74.8	2	2.3	25.0	.4	85.8
85.4	5	5.8	30.8	1.08	86.6
89.1	5	5.8	36.6	1.1	88.7
92.2	3	3.6	40.2	.6	88.3
95.5	8	9.3	49.5	1.7	90.0
97.0	7	8.1	57.6	1.5	91.5
98.5	16	18.6	76.2	3.5	95.0
99.2	8	9.3	85.5	1.7	97.7
99.9	13	15.1	100.6	2.8	100.5
	461				

over the guidelines in Table 2.1 by at least $300. It must be remembered that only 19 percent of the family incomes were located and that the incomes located tend to be the higher incomes because of non-reporting of income by low-income families and families on welfare. Taking this into consideration, it can still be stated at the very least 11.3 percent of all enrollees in OYO exceeded the family income guidelines looking at the percentages of all enrollees in Table 2.2 Some returns for high income families were not located by the Department of Revenue so the actual percentage of those exceeding the income guidelines in Des Moines is probably somewhere between the 11.3 percent figure and 50.0 percent of the enrollees.

The family income figures for Operation Youth Opportunity are given in Table 2.3. The reported incomes by enrollees, parents and the Department of Revenue are included. Nineteen enrollees or 4.1 percent of all enrollees had incomes between $10,000-$15,000 and 37 or 8.0 percent had incomes between $8,000-15,000 according to the State Department of Revenue reports. These families could hardly be called economically disadvantaged.

All programs had policies of admitting youths over the income guidelines if special personal or family circumstances warranted this. Table 2.4 examines some personal and family characteristics of the enrollees in Des Moines who exceeded the family income guidelines according to the State Department of Revenue figures. These characteristics may or may not explain why a portion of the enrollees were admitted despite being over the guidelines.

Fifty-six percent of those exceeding the guidelines were non-white compared to 51.8 percent of all enrollees (67, Data Appendix A). All who reported indicated they expected at least a high school diploma. Over fifty percent

Table 2.3. Family income as reported by enrollees, parents, and the State Department of Revenue for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity[a]

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees	Parents report	% of those reporting
No report	243	0.0	0.0	52.2	52.2	126	0.0
100-2000	10	4.5	4.5	2.1	54.4	26	7.7
2001-3000	40	18.0	22.5	8.3	62.7	62	18.3
3001-3400	8	3.6	26.1	1.7	64.4	28	8.3
3401-3800	21	9.5	35.6	4.5	68.9	44	13.0
3801-4200	21	9.5	45.0	4.5	73.4	44	13.0
4201-4600	5	2.3	47.3	1.1	74.5	13	3.8
4601-5000	20	9.0	56.3	4.3	78.8	38	11.2
5001-5400	7	3.2	59.4	1.5	80.3	10	2.9
5401-5800	5	2.3	61.7	1.1	81.4	11	3.2
5801-6200	23	10.4	72.0	4.9	86.3	23	6.8
6201-6600	5	2.3	74.3	1.1	87.4	9	2.7
6601-7000	18	8.1	82.4	3.8	91.2	16	4.7
7001-8000	8	3.6	86.0	1.7	92.9	7	2.1
8001-10,000	15	6.8	92.7	3.2	96.1	5	1.5
10,001-15,000	16	7.2	100.0	3.4	100.0	1	.3
15,000 +	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	2	.6
Total	465					465	

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix I), Operation Youth Opportunity parents confidential income reports (Appendix A), and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Incomes	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
No report	0.0	27.5	27.5	375	0.0	0.0	80.6	80.6
100-2000	7.7	5.5	33.0	5	5.6	5.6	1.1	81.7
2001-3000	25.9	13.3	46.3	3	3.3	8.9	.6	82.3
3001-3400	34.2	6.0	52.4	4	4.4	13.3	.9	83.2
3401-3800	47.2	9.5	61.8	1	1.1	14.4	.2	83.4
3801-4200	60.1	9.5	71.3	5	5.6	20.0	1.1	84.5
4201-4600	69.0	2.8	74.1	5	5.6	25.5	1.1	85.6
4601-5000	75.2	8.2	82.2	3	3.3	28.9	.6	86.2
5001-5400	78.1	2.1	84.4	1	1.1	30.0	.2	86.4
5401-5800	81.3	2.4	86.7	5	5.6	35.5	1.1	87.5
5801-6200	88.1	4.9	91.6	3	3.3	39.0	.6	88.2
6201-6600	90.8	1.9	93.6	5	5.6	44.4	1.1	89.2
6601-7000	95.5	3.4	97.0	4	4.4	48.8	.9	90.1
7001-8000	97.5	1.5	98.5	9	10.0	58.8	1.9	92.0
8001-10,000	99.0	1.1	99.6	18	20.0	78.8	3.9	95.9
10,001-15,000	99.3	.2	99.8	19	21.1	99.9	4.1	100.0
15,000 +	100.0	.4	100.0	0	0.0	99.9	0.0	100.0
Total				465				

Table 2.4. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Des Moines[a]

Age	14	15	16	17	18	19
Number	12	21	12	7	0	1
%	22.6	39.6	22.6	13.2	0.0	1.9

Sex	Male	Female
Number	31	22
%	58.5	41.5

Race	White	Non-white	No response[b]
Number	22	28	3
%	44.0	56.0	-

Education - Grade	8	9	10	11	No response
Number	13	16	15	7	2
%	25.5	31.4	29.5	13.7	-

School status	Returning to school	Not returning	No response
Number	51	0	2
%	100.0	0.0	-

Expected future education - years	12	13	14	College	Graduate work	No response
Number	14	1	7	19	3	4
%	31.9	2.3	15.9	43.2	6.8	-

Number in household	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11	12+
Number	2	12	6	15	9	4	2	1	2
%	3.8	22.6	11.3	28.3	16.9	7.5	3.8	1.9	3.8

Parental status	Father at home	Father deceased	Father not living at home
Number	49	2	2
%	92.4	3.8	3.8

	Mother at home	Mother deceased	Mother not living at home
Number	49	1	3
%	92.4	1.9	5.7

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

[b]No response is not included in the percentages.

Table 2 4. (Continued)

Social class	I	II	III	IV	V	Not available
Number	0	1	6	27	7	12
%	0.0	2.4	14.6	65.9	17.1	-
Problems with school or law authorities						
Number	6					
%	11.3					

expected to attend college. Eighteen or 34.9 percent came from families larger than six compared to 33.5 percent of all Des Moines participants. At least one parent was missing in 7.6 percent of the homes among these enrollees compared to 46.4 percent of all enrollees in the program. Of the enrollees exceeding the guidelines, 17.1 percent would be classified into social class V, the lower class and 65.9 percent fell into the lower middle class. The enrollees from minority groups, large families, and the lower social class may be disadvantaged but the preceding figures tend to indicate that less than 50 percent of those enrollees exceeding the guidelines could be considered disadvantaged according to the above criterions.

The high expectations for future education, the small number with parents missing, and the small number in the lower social class seem to indicate that most of the enrollees over the guidelines were not disadvantaged.

Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services

The Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services Program (YES) was designed to fill the need for summer employment for youths from low income families, for youths having problems with law authorities, and for youths with special family problems.

Program participants were located through the four neighborhood centers in Cedar Rapids, a local privately endowed community house, the local employment service office, churches, and referrals from school counselors. The radio, television, and newspaper media were used to advertise for applicants. Four-hundred applications were filed for the 200 job slots.

The screening of the applicants took place at two neighborhood centers by a screening committee composed of a neighborhood worker, a community worker, Leo Owens (YES Project Director), a businessman, and a minister. The schools and probation officers were contacted for information about applicants. The applicants were placed in NYC if eligible, then YES if eligible.

The youths had to meet the family size-family income guidelines in Table 2.5 to be eligible for employment with YES. Ten percent of the income requirement could be waived if the youth had special problems (e.g. family, mental health, probation, or police problems or a family services referral). The family income-family size eligibility was determined from the application form (Appendix A) completed by the youth and signed by his parents.

A large number of disadvantaged youth were reached in the YES program as is indicated by the following statistics. Forty-seven out of 226 enrollees indicated they were non-white and a large number of the 42 enrollees who did not respond to this question were probably also non-white.

Table 2.5. Youth Employment Services' family income-family size guidelines[a]

Family size	Family income
1	1600
2	2000
3	2500
4	3200
5	3800
6	4200
7	4700
8	5300
8 +	Add $500 for each additional family member

[a]Source: See Youth Employment Services' application form in Appendix C.

Five percent did not plan to return to school. The family size was greater than six for 36.3 percent of the enrollees. The family head had less than a high school education in 63 families or 37.9 percent. At least one parent was missing or not living at home in 40.5 percent of the families. Sixty of the enrollees had had some contact with the Cedar Rapids police before entering the program. The preceding figures would indicate at least 50 percent of the enrollees could be considered disadvantaged according to the above criterion.[1]

Cedar Rapids had a large number of enrollees who exceeded the income guidelines in Table 2.5. Table 2.6 compares the family incomes as reported

[1]See 67, Data Appendix A for a more complete description of the personal and family characteristics of the enrollees.

Table 2.6. Comparison of reported income with the family income-family size guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services

	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
Not available	131	-	-	66.4	66.4
Below guidelines by					
4500 +	0	-	-	-	66.4
2501-4500	2	2.9	2.9	1.0	67.4
1501-2500	3	4.3	7.2	1.5	69.0
1001-1500	0	-	7.2	-	69.0
601-1000	1	1.4	8.7	.5	69.5
301-600	0	-	8.7	-	69.5
At guidelines	5	7.2	15.9	2.5	72.0
Over guidelines by					
301-600	5	7.2	23.1	2.5	74.6
601-1000	5	7.2	30.4	2.5	77.1
1001-1500	5	7.2	37.6	2.5	79.6
1501-2500	8	11.6	49.2	4.1	83.7
2501-3500	14	20.3	69.5	6.1	89.8
3501-6500	11	15.9	85.4	5.1	94.9
6501 +	10	14.5	99.9	5.1	99.9

[a]Source: Iowa State Department of Revenue.

by the Department of Revenue with the family income-family size guidelines. Looking at the State Department of Revenue figures, 76.9 percent of the reported incomes were over the program guidelines. This constituted 26.4 percent of all enrollees. The guidelines were exceeded by at least $1,000 by 62.4 percent of the enrollees with incomes reported. It must be remembered that the incomes located by the Department of Revenue tended to be the ones in the upper income ranges because of non-reporting by low-income families and families on welfare. Because of incomplete names for some

enrollees' parents and lack of social security numbers for parents, the Department of Revenue also missed a number of high incomes. The lowest possible percentage for those exceeding the family income guideline in YES is 26.4 percent and the actual figure could range as high as 50 percent.

Table 2.7 gives a listing of the family incomes as reported by the enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for YES. Of the family incomes available from the State Department of Revenue, 74.1 percent were above $5,000 or 25.1 percent of all enrollees. Twenty-seven enrollees had family incomes above $8,000. Thirty-nine or 56.8 percent of the enrollees with incomes reported had family incomes over $7,000. This was 19.5 percent of all enrollees. A large number of youths in YES could not be called economically disadvantaged.

Table 2.8 looks at the personal and family characteristics of those YES enrollees who exceeded the family income guidelines according to tax return figures. According to the criterions below these youth may or may not be considered disadvantaged. Fourteen enrollees and possibly a number of the 14 not responding to this question were non-white. This is larger than the 25 percent of all enrollees plus non-respondents who were non-white for the whole program. Only one enrollee indicated he would not return to school. All but one enrollee expected to receive at least a high school education while 36.1 percent expect to graduate from college. Twenty-three or 47.1 percent came from families with more than 6 members compared to 36.3 percent of all enrollees. Twenty-five or 48.1 percent fall into the lower social class. Because of family size, social class, race, and missing parents, about 50 percent could be considered somewhat disadvantaged. A large number of enrollees not disadvantaged by the preceding criterions were in the YES program.

Table 2.7. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services[a]

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	108	-	-	54.0
100-2000	3	3.3	-	1.5
2001-3000	12	13.0	16.3	6.0
3001-3400	5	5.4	21.7	2.5
3401-3800	8	8.7	30.4	4.0
3801-4200	9	9.8	40.2	4.5
4201-4600	6	6.5	46.7	3.0
4601-5000	9	9.8	56.5	4.5
5001-5400	4	4.3	60.8	2.0
5401-5800	6	6.5	67.3	3.0
5801-6200	9	9.7	77.0	4.5
6201-6600	6	6.5	83.5	3.0
6601-7000	4	4.3	87.8	2.0
7001-8000	3	3.3	91.1	1.5
8001-10,000	7	7.6	98.7	3.5
10,001-15,000	1	1.1	99.8	.5
15,000 +	0	-	-	-
Total	200			

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix A) and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
-	131	-	-	65.5	65.5
55.5	4	5.8	5.8	2.0	67.5
61.5	1	1.4	7.2	.5	68.0
64.0	5	7.2	14.4	2.5	70.5
68.0	3	4.3	18.7	1.5	72.0
72.5	0	-	18.7	-	72.0
75.5	3	4.3	23.0	1.5	73.5
80.0	2	2.9	25.9	1.0	74.5
82.0	1	1.4	27.3	.5	75.0
85.0	2	2.9	30.2	1.0	76.0
89.5	4	5.8	36.0	2.0	78.0
92.5	2	2.9	38.9	1.0	79.0
94.5	3	4.3	43.2	1.5	80.5
96.0	12	17.4	60.6	6.0	86.5
99.5	17	24.6	85.2	8.5	95.0
100.0	9	13.0	98.2	4.5	99.5
-	1	1.4	99.6	.5	100.0
	200				

Table 2.8. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services[a]

Age	14	15	16	17	18
Number	19	18	13	8	3
%	31.1	29.5	21.3	13.1	4.9

Sex	Male	Female
Number	42	19
%	68.9	31.1

Race	White	Non-white	No response
Number	33	14	14
%	70.0	30.0	-

Education - Grade	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Number	1	6	10	18	16	5	1	1
%	1.7	10.3	17.2	31.0	27.6	8.6	1.7	1.7

School status	Returning to school	Not returning	No response
Number	58	1	3
%	98.3	1.7	-

Expected future education - years	10	11	12	13	14	College	Graduate work	Other	No response
Number	1	0	17	0	5	19	2	14	3
%	1.7	0.0	29.4	0.0	8.6	32.7	3.4	24.1	-

Number in household	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number	1	7	13	8	9	3	3	11	3	3
%	1.6	11.5	21.3	13.1	14.8	4.9	4.9	18.0	4.9	4.9

Parental status	Father at home	Father deceased	Father not living at home	No response
Number	48	4	7	2
%	80.0	7.0	13.0	-

	Mother at home	Mother deceased	Mother not living at home	No response
Number	56	1	2	2
%	95.0	1.7	3.4	-

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

Table 2.8. (Continued)

Social class	I	II	III	IV	V
Number	0	1	1	25	25
%	0.0	1.9	1.9	48.1	48.1
Problems with school or law authorities					
Number	13				
%	11.3				

Waterloo's Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc.

In Waterloo, program administrators felt that the Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc. Program (MIS) would fill the employment needs of 14 and 15 year old youths too young to be eligible for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and too young and inexperienced to compete with older youths for jobs available from other sources. Also it was felt that some youths needed assistance finding employment even if they did not meet the guidelines for Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The jobs were advertised through newspapers, radio, television, the schools, and community houses. Youths were referred to the program by the schools, community houses, juvenile officers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and social workers as part of an outreach system. A total of 517 applications were received at the schools, community houses, and the Iowa State Employment Service for the 140 job slots.

The 140 enrollees were selected by a screening committee composed of a juvenile officer, the director of guidance for the public schools, NYC representatives, Jesse Cosby Center representatives, an Iowa State Employment

Service representative, social workers, and ministers. Because of the varied background of the members of the screening committee and their work with the disadvantaged in Waterloo, the committee had a personal knowledge of the situation of most applicants. Family income, family size, and a knowledge of the needy applicants was used to determine eligibility for the MIS program. No direct question about family income was asked on application forms but the youths were asked to indicate their family size and place of employment of their father and mother. The family income was estimated from a knowledge of wage rates in the Waterloo area.[1]

An examination of the personal and family characteristics of the enrollees in Waterloo reveals many characteristics indicating many enrollees were disadvantaged. Over 50 percent of the enrollees were non-white. Seventy-two enrollees or 67.7 percent came from households with more than six people. In 38.5 percent of the households, the family head had less than a high school education. At least one parent was missing in 42.2 percent of the homes.[2]

Although the above figures indicate many enrollees were disadvantaged, a large number of enrollees had high family incomes. Table 2.9 gives the family incomes as reported for Waterloo by the enrollees and by the Department of Revenue. Twenty-four enrollees had incomes above $6,200 according to Department of Revenue figures. These enrollees comprised 21.6 percent of the youth in the program and 72.8 percent of the enrollees with income

---

[1]See Appendix A for a copy of the application form used to determine eligibility.

[2]67, Data Appendix A gives a more complete description of personal and family characteristics of the enrollees.

Table 2.9. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Waterloo's MIS program[a]

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	67	-	-	60.4
100-2000	0	-	-	-
2001-3000	4	9.1	-	3.6
3001-3400	0	-	-	
3401-3800	5	11.4	20.5	4.5
3801-4200	2	4.5	25.0	1.8
4201-4600	3	6.8	31.8	2.7
4601-5000	4	9.1	40.9	3.6
5001-5400	0	-	-	-
5401-5800	1	2.3	43.2	.9
5801-6200	7	15.9	59.1	6.3
6201-6600	2	4.5	63.6	1.8
6601-7000	4	9.1	72.7	3.6
7001-8000	8	18.2	90.9	7.2
8001-10,000	2	4.5	95.4	1.8
10,001-15,000	2	4.5	99.9	1.8
15,000 +	0	-	-	-
Total	111			

[a]Source: Iowa State Department of Revenue and Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix I).

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
	78	-	-	70.3	-
	4	12.1		3.6	73.9
64.0	1	3.0	15.1	.9	74.8
	0	-	-	-	
68.5	0	-	-	-	
70.3	1	3.0	18.1	.9	75.7
73.0	1	3.0	21.1	.9	76.6
76.6	0	-	-	-	
	0	-	-	-	
77.5	2	6.1	27.2	1.8	78.4
83.8	0	-	-	-	
85.6	4	12.1	39.3	3.6	82.0
89.2	0	-	-	-	
96.4	13	39.4	78.7	11.7	93.7
98.2	3	9.1	87.8	2.7	96.4
100.0	4	12.1	99.9	3.6	100.0
-	0	-	-	-	-
	111				

data available. A warning must again be given that the available income figures are skewed towards the upper income ranges because of non-reporting of income by low-income and welfare families.

In Waterloo income information was available for over 300 youth not selected by the screening committee for summer employment. Table 2.10 gives the reported incomes for this group. Of the reported incomes in this group 87.3 percent were above $6,200 according to Department of Revenue income figures and 8.5 percent were below $5,000. It appears that some youths with low family incomes may have been overlooked in the selection process.

The Waterloo enrollees and the applicants not selected were compared with the guidelines for the Des Moines program in Table 2.1 to give a measure of the economically disadvantaged among MIS enrollees. The Des Moines guidelines were not used or suggested for use in Waterloo. They are used only for a guide to comparison.

Table 2.11 shows that at least 21.1 percent of Waterloo's enrollees would have exceeded Des Moines' guidelines. Eight enrollees plus a percentage of the 78 enrollees with no family income reported would be in the low income range and able to meet the guidelines in Table 2.1. The actual number exceeding these guidelines would be between 21.1 percent and 50.0 percent of all enrollees.

Table 2.12 examines the personal and family characteristics of those youths who would have exceeded the Des Moines family income-family size guideline. The non-white percentage of enrollees over the guidelines was 31.8 percent compared to approximately 50 percent for all enrollees. All were planning to return to school in the fall. A very large percentage, 87.4, came from large families of over six members. One parent was missing

Table 2.10: Family income as reported by the youths not selected and the State Department of Revenue figures for these youths not selected for Waterloo's MIS program[a]

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	101	-	-	27.3
100-2000	5	1.9	-	1.4
2001-3000	4	1.5	3.4	1.1
3001-3400	4	1.5	4.9	1.1
3401-3800	12	4.6	9.5	3.3
3801-4200	9	3.4	12.9	2.5
4201-4600	0	1.9	14.8	1.4
4601-5000	29	11.1	25.9	8.0
5001-5400	2	.8	26.7	.6
5401-5800	6	2.3	29.0	1.7
5801-6200	22	8.4	37.4	6.1
6201-6600	9	3.4	40.8	2.5
6601-7000	30	11.5	52.3	8.3
7001-8000	42	16.0	68.3	11.6
8001-10,000	48	18.3	86.6	13.2
10,001-15,000	30	11.5	98.1	8.3
15,000 +	5	1.9	100.0	1.4
Total	358			

[a]Source: Iowa State Department of Revenue and Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
-	173	-	-	47.6	-
28.7	5	2.6	-	1.4	49.0
29.9	2	1.1	3.7	.6	49.7
31.0	0	-	3.7	-	49.7
34.3	1	.5	4.2	.3	50.0
36.8	2	1.1	5.3	.6	50.6
38.2	4	2.1	7.4	1.1	51.7
46.0	2	1.1	8.5	.6	52.3
46.6	1	.5	9.0	1.1	53.4
48.3	4	2.1	11.1	1.1	54.5
54.4	3	1.6	12.7	.8	55.3
56.9	7	3.7	16.4	1.9	57.2
65.2	7	3.7	20.1	1.9	59.1
76.8	26	13.7	33.8	7.2	66.3
90.0	53	27.9	61.7	14.6	80.9
98.3	61	32.1	93.8	16.8	97.7
99.7	12	6.3	100.1	3.0	100.7
	363				

Table 2.11. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Waterloo MIS enrollees[a]

	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of enrollees
Not available	78	-	-	70.9	70.9
Below guidelines by					
4500 +	2	6.3	6.3	1.8	72.7
2501-4500	2	6.3	12.5	1.8	74.5
1501-2500	0	-	12.5	-	74.5
1001-1500	0	-	12.5	-	74.5
601-1000	1	3.1	15.6	.9	75.4
301-600	2	6.3	21.9	1.8	77.2
At guidelines	1	3.1	25.0	.9	78.1
Above guidelines by					
301-600	2	6.3	31.2	1.8	79.9
601-1000	0	-	31.2	-	
1001-1500	8	25.0	56.2	7.3	87.2
1501-2500	7	21.9	78.1	6.4	93.6
2501-3500	4	12.5	90.6	3.6	97.2
3501-6500	3	9.4	99.9	2.7	99.9
6500 +	0	-	99.9	-	99.9
Total	110				

[a]Source: The Iowa State Department of Revenue and Table 3.1.

in 23.8 percent of the homes. A total of 11 enrollees or 64.7 percent were in the lower social class. Family size, missing parents, and low social classes indicate that as many as 90 percent of these enrollees may be disadvantaged according to some of the above criterion while exceeding the income guidelines.

Table 2.12. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding a family income guideline for Waterloo MIS enrollees[a]

Age	14	15	16					
Number	14	6	2					
%	63.6	27.3	9.1					
Sex	Male	Female						
Number	21	1						
%	95.5	4.5						
Race	White	Non-white						
Number	15	7						
%	68.2	31.8						
Education - Grade	8	9	10					
Number	12	8	2					
%	54.5	36.4	9.1					
School status	Returning to school		Not returning					
Number	22		0					
%	100.0		0.0					
Expected future education - years	12	13	14	College	Other			
Number	11	1	2	6	2			
%	50.0	4.5	9.1	27.3	9.1			
Number in household	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number	1	1	3	5	6	2	0	4
%	4.5	4.5	13.6	22.7	27.3	9.1	0.0	18.2
Parental status	Father at home	Father deceased	Father not living at home	No response				
Number	16	0	5	1				
%	76.2	0.0	23.8	-				
	Mother at home	Mother deceased	Mother not living at home					
Number	22	0	0					
%	100.0	0.0						

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

Table 2.12. (Continued)

Social class	I	II	III	IV	V
Number	0	0	2	4	11
%	0.0	0.0	11.8	23.5	64.7
Problems with school or law authorities					
Number	5				
%	13.7				

Davenport Community Pride Inc.

In the Davenport Community Pride Inc. Program (CPI), all unemployed youth between 14-21 were eligible for employment. A priority was given to disadvantaged and minority group youth. Applicants were referred to CPI by the schools, NYC and The Friendly House. CPI did the screening for the program. The youths were admitted if they met the OEO income guidelines or if they were referred to the program because of special needs.

This evaluation of selection includes only those 60 youths in the Play Corps portion of the CPI program. The personal and family characteristics of the Play Corps leaders indicate that many disadvantaged youth were employed by Play Corps. Almost 50 percent of the enrollees were non-white. Thirty enrollees or 50 percent came from families larger than six members. The family head had less than a high school education in 50 percent of the families. In 16 families one parent was missing.[1] There were some youths from high income families in the Play Corps program.

According to Table 2.13, 10 enrollees had family incomes above $7,000

[1]See 67, Data Appendix A for a complete description of enrollee characteristics.

Table 2.13. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Davenport Play Corps enrollees[a]

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	33	-	-	55.0
100-2000	2	7.4	-	3.3
2001-3000	2	7.4	14.8	3.3
3001-3400	0	-	14.8	-
3401-3800	1	3.7	18.5	1.7
3801-4200	3	11.1	29.6	5.0
4201-4600	0	-	29.6	-
4601-5000	4	14.8	44.4	6.7
5001-5400	0	-	44.4	-
5401-5800	3	11.1	55.5	5.0
5801-6200	4	14.8	70.3	6.7
6201-6600	0	-	70.3	-
6601-7000	2	7.4	77.7	3.3
7001-8000	2	7.4	85.1	3.3
8001-10,000	3	11.1	96.2	5.0
10,001-15,000	0	-	96.2	-
15,000 +	1	3.7	99.9	1.7
Total	60			

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
55.0	44	-	-	73.3	73.3
58.3	2	12.5	12.5	3.3	76.6
61.6	0	-	12.5	-	76.6
61.6	0	-	12.5	-	76.6
63.3	0	-	12.5	-	76.6
68.3	1	6.3	18.8	1.7	78.3
68.3	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
75.0	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
75.0	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
80.0	1	6.3	25.1	1.7	80.0
86.7	1	6.3	31.4	1.7	81.7
86.7	1	6.3	37.7	1.7	83.4
90.0	0	-	37.7	-	83.4
93.3	2	12.5	50.2	3.3	86.7
98.3	4	25.0	75.2	6.7	93.4
98.3	3	18.8	94.0	5.0	95.4
100.0	1	6.3	100.3	1.7	100.1
	60				

using Department of Revenue income reports. Three enrollees had family incomes between $10,000 to $15,000 and one enrollee had a family income greater than $15,000.

The enrollees who exceeded the guidelines set in Table 2.1 are shown in Table 2.14. At least 15.0 percent of all enrollees exceeded the income guidelines used in the Des Moines program. Three exceeded those guidelines by over $6,500. Of the 12 who exceeded the guidelines, six were paid by Neighborhood Youth Corps funds.

The personal and family characteristics of the six youths paid by Community Pride Inc. who were over the Des Moines guidelines are given in Table 2.15. The Des Moines guidelines were used in this evaluation to give a general guide to who might be economically disadvantaged. These guidelines were not suggested for or used in Davenport.

The personal and family characteristics in Table 2.15 did not indicate a large portion of these youth being disadvantaged. Thirty-three percent were non-white. All expected to return to school. All expected at least a high school education. Thirty-three percent came from families with over six members. One was missing a parent. Two fell into the lower social class.

A significant statistic in Davenport was the fact that six Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees in Play Corps could not meet the family income-family size guidelines in Table 2.1 which are more liberal than the NYC guidelines. It appears the federal program was not able or willing to screen out the enrollees with high incomes.

Table 2.14. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Davenport Play Corps enrollees[a]

	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum % of reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of enrollees
Not available	44	-	-	73.3	73.3
Below guidelines by					
4500 +	0	-	-	-	73.3
2501-4500	2	12.5	12.5	3.3	76.6
1501-2500	1	6.3	18.8	1.7	78.3
1001-1500	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
601-1000	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
301-600	1	6.3	25.1	1.7	80.0
At guidelines	0	-	25.1	-	80.0
Above guidelines by					
301-600	0	-	25.1	-	80.0
601-1000	0	-	25.1	-	80.0
1001-1500	3	18.8	43.9	5.0	85.0
1501-2500	3	18.8	62.7	5.0	90.0
2501-3500	1	6.3	69.0	1.7	91.7
3501-6500	2	12.5	81.5	3.3	95.0
6500 +	3	18.8	100.0	5.0	100.0

[a]Source: The Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Summary and comparison of selected characteristics of I-TRY enrollees in the four programs

Cedar Rapids had the largest percentage of enrollees over the income guidelines according to available family income figures. Waterloo had the smallest percentage over the guidelines of those with family income figures available and the second smallest percentage of all enrollees over the guidelines.

Des Moines had the largest percentage of non-whites among all enrollees and among those enrollees over the family income guidelines. Waterloo was

Table 2.15. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for the Play Corps enrollees paid by CPI[a]

Age	14	15	16		
Number	1	4	1		
%	16.7	66.7	16.7		
Sex	Male	Female			
Number	3	3			
%	50.0	50.0			
Race	White	Non-white			
Number	4	2			
%	66.7	33.3			
Education - Grade	7	8	9		
Number	1	1	4		
%	16.7	16.7	66.7		
School status	Returning to school		Not returning		
Number	6		0		
%	100.0		0.0		
Expected future education	High school		College	Other	
Number	2		3	1	
%	33.3		50.0	16.7	
Number in household	4	5	6	9	10
Number	2	1	1	1	1
%	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7
Parental status	Father at home		Father deceased		Father not living at home
Number	5		0		1
%	84.3		0.0		16.7
	Mother at home		Mother deceased		Mother not living at home
Number	6		0		0
%	100.0		0.0		0.0

[a]Source: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix I).

Table 2.15. (Continued)

Social class	I	II	III	IV	V
Number	1	0	1	2	2
%	16.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	33.3
Problems with school and law authorities					
Number	1				
%	12.5				

Table 2.16. Summary of enrollees over the income guidelines by over $300, Department of Revenue figures[a]

	% incomes located	Number exceeding guidelines	% of those with income figures available	% of all enrollees in the program
Des Moines' OYO	19.4	60	69.2	13.4
Cedar Rapid's YES	34.5	58	84.1	28.0
Waterloo's MIS	29.7	24	66.7	21.9
Davenport's Play Corps	30.0	12	75.0	25.0

[a]Source: The preceding tables in Chapter II.

second in the percentage of non-white enrollees.

Des Moines had the largest number of school dropouts in their program. Cedar Rapids was second with 5.1 percent. Only Cedar Rapids had a school dropout among those enrollees exceeding the guidelines.

Waterloo had the largest percentage of enrollees from large families. Des Moines was third among all enrollees and second among those over the guidelines.

Table 2.17. Summary of race of all enrollees and those over the income guidelines[a]

	% non-white of all enrollees in the program	% non-white of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	51.8	56.0
Cedar Rapids' YES	25.5	30-40
Waterloo's MIS	50.5	31.8
Davenport's Play Corps	40.5	25.0

[a]Source: The preceding tables in Chapter II 67, Data Appendix A.

Table 2.18. Summary of enrollees dropping out of school[a]

	% school dropouts of all enrollees in the program	% school dropouts of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	9.0	0.0
Cedar Rapids' YES	5.1	1.7
Waterloo's MIS	1.8	0.0
Davenport's Play Corps	1.9	0.0

[a]Source: The preceding tables in Chapter II 67, Data Appendix A.

Des Moines had the largest percentage of enrollees with a parent missing, but the smallest percentage of enrollees over the guidelines with parents missing. Waterloo and Cedar Rapids were second and third in the percentage of all enrollees with parents missing and first and second in the percentage of those enrollees over the guidelines with parents missing.

Table 2.19. Summary of enrollees from households of over six members[a]

	% of all enrollees in the program	% of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	33.5	43.9
Cedar Rapids' YES	36.3	37.6
Waterloo's MIS	66.1	77.3
Davenport's Play Corps	45.0	25.0

[a]Source: The preceding tables in Chapter II 67, Data Appendix A.

Table 2.20. Summary of enrollees missing at least one parent[a]

	% of all enrollees in the program	% of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	43.4	7.6
Cedar Rapids' YES	40.5	20.0
Waterloo's MIS	42.2	23.8
Davenport's Play Corps	27.1	16.7

[a]Source: The preceding tables in Chapter II 67, Data Appendix A.

Waterloo had the largest percentage of those enrollees exceeding family incomes guidelines falling into lower social class. Cedar Rapids was second with 48.1 percent. The largest percentage of enrollees fell into the two lower classes in all four programs.

The preceding statistics indicate that Waterloo and Des Moines had the largest percentage of disadvantaged youths in their programs. Waterloo had

Table 2.21. Summary of social class of those enrollees over the income guidelines[a]

	% in the lower middle class	% in the lower class
Des Moines' OYO	65.9	17.1
Cedar Rapids' YES	48.1	48.1
Waterloo's MIS	23.5	64.7
Davenport's Play Corps	37.5	37.5

[a]Source: The preceding tables in Chapter II.

the smallest percentage over the income guidelines, the second largest percentage of non-white enrollees, the largest percentage of enrollees from large families, the second largest percentage with at least one parent missing, and the largest percentage of those over the income guidelines in the lower social class. A disadvantaged group not served in the Waterloo program was school dropouts.

Des Moines had the second smallest percentage of those over the guidelines, the largest percentage of non-whites, the largest percentage of school dropouts, and the second largest percentage from large families.

Cedar Rapids had the largest percentage over the guidelines, the smallest percentage of non-white enrollees, the second largest percentage of school dropouts, and the third largest percentage with at least one parent missing.

There may have been a smaller number of disadvantaged enrollees in YES because Cedar Rapids may have had less disadvantaged youths in their community to select from. Cedar Rapids has the lowest percentage of families

under $5,000 income of all four cities (52, Table 76) and the lowest percentage of non-whites (51, Table 20).

The number of enrollees was too small in Davenport to give a valid comparison with the other cities.

A Summary of the Characteristics of all I-TRY Participants[1]

Project I-TRY concentrated mainly on the employment of 14-16 year-olds. Ninety-four percent of the enrollees were in this age group. These teenagers have the most difficulty locating summer jobs and were willing to work for the comparatively low wage scales in the I-TRY programs. Three programs paid only $1.00 per hour.

The number of jobs available for girls was less than for the boys. There were many outdoor jobs suitable for inexperienced workers but unsuitable for girls. Sixty-two percent of the enrollees were boys.

The percentage of non-white enrollees in the I-TRY programs was much larger than the percentage of non-whites in the total population of the four cities with I-TRY programs. About 45 percent of all I-TRY enrollees were non-white while the percentage of non-white youths among teenagers 14-19 years of age in all four cities combined was only 5.2 in 1966 (53, Table 2; 54, Table 2; 55, Table 2; 56, Table 2). The percentage of enrollees over the income guidelines who were non-white was also much larger than the percentage of the total population who were non-white. It appears that the non-white applicant found it easier to gain admission to the I-TRY

---

[1]See 67, Data Appendix A for a complete enumeration of statistics used in this section.

programs. As stated earlier, these programs were developed after the riots and civil disorders of 1967. The admission of large numbers of non-white youths to the I-TRY programs fits in well with the goal of reducing racial tensions in Iowa's major cities. The most militant group in the urban areas are not necessarily the low-income non-whites but the middle class blacks with high future expectations for employment and education. This group is easily frustrated by a lack of opportunity. I-TRY gave a number of these youths an opportunity for summer employment.

The largest portion of I-TRY participants were planning to return to school. Of all enrollees, only 4.6 percent had dropped out of school or were planning to drop out of school. One of the goals of the I-TRY program was to eliminate the financial and employment incentive to drop out of school. Economic problems and employment ranked high among Project I-TRY enrollees as reasons for dropping out of school. Thirty-three percent of those enrollees leaving school dropped out. A later publication of the I-TRY evaluation will assess the effect of the programs on the dropout problem.

Forty percent of all enrollees came from households with over six members. The average size of households was 6.15 people. The many enrollees from large families reflects an appreciation by the I-TRY programs for the special needs of these youths.

In 41 percent of the enrollees' families, the family head did not have a high school education. It is noteworthy that 99 percent of the enrollees hope to achieve this goal their parents may not have reached.

In at least 41.5 percent of the homes at least one parent was missing. Eleven percent of the enrollees' fathers were deceased while 31 percent were

not living at home for some other reason. A large number of enrollees came from families on welfare. The preceding statistics on broken homes reflect a welfare system that tends to split up the lower income family. Families may not be able to receive welfare payments if a male parent is living at home. The Project I-TRY programs recognized the problems of youths from broken homes by providing jobs for them.

An Evaluation of the Reliability of Parental and Enrollee Reports of Income for Use in Screening Applicants

In all the I-TRY programs, family income was one of the criteria for selection of enrollees. The correct determination of family income appears to have been a problem for all th programs. A comparison of the enrollees' income reports, the parents' income reports, and the income reports from the State Department of Revenue gave an opportunity to assess the accuracy of the use of the parents' and enrollees' reported income for screening youths into these programs. The comparisons are made in Table 2.22 for Des Moines and Table 2.23 for Cedar Rapids, Davenport, and Waterloo.

Table 2.22 indicates that 41 or 73.2 percent of the parents with income reports available reported less income to OYO than they did on their income tax forms. Ten parents or 17.9 percent reported at least $4,500 less income to OYO than on their income tax forms. Thirty parents or 53.6 percent reported over $1,000 less income to OYO. The figures should have been approximately the same since the parents filled out their income reports to OYO in May and June just after the deadline for filing state income tax reports for 1967. A discrepancy may have resulted in some cases because of the adjusted gross income figure being used from the tax reports versus the

Table 2.22. Comparison of reported family incomes for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity[a]

	Enrollees report minus Dept. of Revenue report		
	Number	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting
Not available	420	-	-
-4501 +	7	15.6	15.6
-4500-2501	2	4.4	20.0
-2500-1501	8	17.8	37.8
-1500-1001	3	6.7	44.4
-1000-601	3	6.7	51.1
-600-301	3	6.7	57.7
-300-101	2	4.4	62.2
-100-+100	0	-	62.2
+101-300	0	-	62.2
+301-600	4	8.9	71.1
+601-1000	1	2.2	73.3
+1001-1500	4	8.9	82.2
+1501-2500	1	2.2	84.4
+2501-3500	5	11.1	95.5
+3501-6500	1	2.2	97.7
+6501 +	1	2.2	99.9
Total	465		

[a]Source: The Iowa State Department of Revenue, Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix A) and Operation Youth Opportunity parents confidential family income report form (Appendix A).

Enrollees report minus parents report			Parents report minus Dept. of Revenue report		
Number	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of those available
303	-	-	409	-	-
1	.6	.6	10	17.9	17.9
1	.6	1.2	6	10.7	28.6
5	3.1	4.3	9	16.1	44.6
9	5.6	9.9	5	8.9	53.6
10	6.2	16.1	6	10.7	64.3
12	7.4	23.5	5	8.9	73.2
3	1.9	25.4	0	-	73.2
46	28.4	53.8	4	7.1	80.3
10	6.2	60.0	1	1.8	82.1
13	8.0	68.0	1	1.8	83.9
15	9.3	77.3	1	1.8	85.7
9	5.6	82.9	4	7.1	92.8
14	8.6	91.5	1	1.8	94.6
8	4.9	96.4	3	5.4	100.0
1	.6	97.0	0	-	100.0
5	3.1	100.1	0	-	100.0
465			465		

Table 2.23. Enrollees reported family income minus Department of Revenue reported income[a]

Difference	Cedar Rapids		
	Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of reports available
Not available	167	-	-
-4501 +	4	12.1	12.1
-4500-2501	3	9.1	21.2
-2500-1501	3	9.1	30.3
-1500-1001	0	-	30.3
-1000-601	4	12.1	42.4
-600-301	3	9.1	51.5
-300-101	3	9.1	60.6
-100-+100	3	9.1	69.7
+101-300	1	3.0	72.7
+301-600	1	3.0	75.8
+601-1000	2	6.1	81.8
+1001-1500	3	9.1	90.9
+1501-2500	1	3.0	93.9
+2501-3500	1	3.0	96.9
+3501-6500	1	3.0	99.9
+6501 +	0	-	99.9
Total	200		

[a]Source: The Iowa State Department of Revenue and Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (67, Questionnaire Appendix I).

Waterloo			Davenport		
Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of reports available	Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of reports available
96	-	-	52	-	-
1	6.7	6.7	0	-	-
1	6.7	13.3	2	25.0	25.0
1	6.7	20.0	1	12.5	37.5
1	6.7	26.6	2	25.0	62.5
0	-	26.6	0	-	62.5
2	13.3	40.0	0	-	62.5
2	13.3	53.3	1	12.5	75.0
0	-	53.3	0	-	75.0
2	13.3	66.6	0	-	75.0
1	6.7	73.3	0	-	75.0
0	-	73.3	1	12.5	87.5
0	-	73.3	0	-	87.5
1	6.7	80.0	0	-	87.5
2	13.3	93.3	0	-	87.5
0	-	93.3	0	-	87.5
1	6.7	99.9	1	12.5	100.0
111			60		

gross income report asked for by OYO. The gross income report includes sick pay, moving expenses, business expenses for employees, and payments of self-employed persons to retirement funds which are not included in the adjusted gross income report.

The parents were not a reliable source of family income information according to the preceding results. When whether their child got a summer job depended upon family income, the parents tended to report less income. Many parents cannot understand why their child shouldn't have the same chance to find a summer job as a youth from a low-income family down the street. These parents in many cases were willing to misrepresent their family income to gain their child a summer job.

It appears that good screening results will not be achieved from a complete reliance upon a parent's report of family income. Too many parents are willing to give a false report of family income when there appears to be no penalty for dishonesty. Programs of this type in the future will have to find ways to verify reported income figures or rely more heavily upon other criteria for screening applicants.

The enrollees also appeared to be an unreliable source of family income information. A large number of enrollees, usually about half, in each program were not aware of what their family income was or were unwilling to answer this question. Of the enrollees with income reports available in Des Moines, only 13 of 45 came within $1,000 of the family income figure reported by the State Department of Revenue. According to Table 2.23, only 17 of 33 enrollees in Cedar Rapids came within $1,000 of State Department of Revenue figures. In Davenport, only 2 of 8 enrollees came within $1,000.

A program will not achieve good results in screening applicants by the

sole use of family income reported from parents or enrollees unless some method is available to verify these reports. It is unfair to penalize those people who are honest in reporting their income by denying their children jobs while admitting youths with the same family incomes whose parents are willing to misrepresent their income.

Some Suggestions for the Selection of Disadvantaged Youths for Employment Programs

The persons responsible for selection of applicants should be aware of the type of applicant the program is designed to serve. The I-TRY programs were primarily designed to serve disadvantaged youths 14-16 years of age and youths from minority groups.

The screening should be done by persons familiar with the personal and home situations of the applicants if at all possible. In this way the programs do not have to depend entirely upon unreliable income data to select the most needy applicants. Also many applicants may be more in need of an employment experience than others having smaller family incomes. The only way to evaluate these cases is by a personal knowledge of the youths involved.

If family income reports from the parents are used to screen applicants, the reliability of these reports could be checked by asking on the same forms, the employer and occupation of the parents. This might make the parents more inclined to give an honest answer concerning family income. The family income figure received could be verified by estimating their income from a knowledge of the parents' occupations and wage rates in the area.

The MIS program in Waterloo did as good a job in screening as the other

programs without family income information from the parents. They used a family income estimate, derived from the parents' occupations, plus a knowledge of each applicant to select enrollees. In this way the parents are not put in the inevitable position of denying their child a summer job by correctly reporting the family income. People who feel that their family income is confidential do not have to be asked to divulge this information.

The program should be brought to the attention of the disadvantaged through the schools and those people who work with the disadvantaged. The disadvantaged youth may be the least likely to be aggressive in seeking out employment. He may also be the least likely to be aware of possibilities that exist for summer employment. The programs will not reach the needy youths unless there is a vigorous outreach system to bring these youths into the pool of applicants.

Some of the I-TRY programs relied almost entirely upon the schools to provide applicants for their programs. Many disadvantaged youth no longer enrolled in the schools may have been missed. These youths may have been most in need of employment experience. There is also a possibility that many of these dropouts could have been encouraged to return to school through the counseling services in these employment programs. A greater effort could be made to reach out-of-school youth.

Instead of setting up only a family income-family size guideline, the program could set up a multi-faceted guideline to include all the variables they feel are important in indicating the youths most in need of their program. The variables might include family income, family size, race, sex, family stability, mental stability of the applicant, behavioral problems, future expectations, achievement potential, social grace, etc. Under this

guideline, several combinations of these variables could admit a youth to the program. If more information is gathered about the applicants before the program, there would also be a greater opportunity to place an enrollee into employment best fitting his situation.

Chapter 3

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At the urging of Governor Harold E. Hughes of Iowa, private business and industry plus interested citizens organized and funded youth-work programs in many Iowa cities during the summers of 1967 and 1968. Over 1,100 youths were provided employment by these programs in the summer of 1968. Most of the jobs were in the non-profit sector of the community with the wages being paid by a non-profit community corporation, funded and organized by the private sector of the community.

The U.S. Department of Labor through the Iowa Manpower Development Council provided $1 for ancillary and supportive services for every $4 the private sector raised to pay wages and administrative costs. Cedar Rapids, Davenport, Des Moines, and Waterloo took advantage of the matching funds for ancillary and supportive services.

Funds were also provided to the Industrial Relations Center of Iowa State University to conduct an evaluation of the youth employment programs receiving Project I-TRY (Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth) funds. This study is a part of that evaluation.

All of the I-TRY programs had as a goal the provision of a meaningful work experience for disadvantaged youth in their community. This study assesses the effectiveness of the programs in reaching and selecting dis-

advantaged youths. The personal and family characteristics of all the enrollees were examined, the family incomes as reported by the Iowa State Department of Revenue were compared with the family income-family size guidelines for the various programs, and the personal and family characteristics of those enrollees over the family income guidelines were studied.

A large portion of the enrollees in Project I-TRY were disadvantaged youths. This was indicated by the numbers of youths from families receiving welfare payments, the 40 percent of enrollees coming from households with over six members, the 41.5 percent of enrollees from families with at least one parent missing, the 46 percent of enrollees who were nonwhite, the numbers of enrollees who had past problems with law authorities, and the enrollees not planning to continue their schooling.

A large number of enrollees in each program were not economically disadvantaged according to the family income-family size guidelines. An estimated 25-50 percent of the enrollees exceeded the family income guidelines according to family income information from the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Of those exceeding the family income guidelines, a number were admitted to the I-TRY programs because of special circumstances (e.g. personal problems, mental problems, family problems, discipline problems, etc.). The programs felt they should be flexible in their admission criterions to help the youths with the most need for an employment experience regardless of family income. A number of those enrollees exceeding the family income guideline could be considered disadvantaged on the basis of family size, race, low social class, and other criterions. Family income by itself may not give an adequate picture of those youths with the most need.

The I-TRY programs admitted a much larger percentage of non-white applicants than the percentage of non-white population in the various communities. This reflects a greater need by non-white youth for employment and a desire by the programs to reduce racial tensions in their cities.

The parents of the applicants to Operation Youth Opportunity (OYO) in Des Moines were an unreliable source of income information according to comparisons of their income reports with the Iowa State Department of Revenue reports. Many parents were unwilling to state their correct family income realizing this would deny their son or daughter a summer job in OYO.

The best way to get the needy to apply is to use a vigorous outreach system to acquaint the disadvantaged with the opportunities for employment. The best way to select the most needy of the applicants for a youth employment program is to have a screening committee which is familiar with the applicants and their families.

The four I-TRY programs were successful in providing an employment experience for 1,100 youths. A majority were disadvantaged youths when compared with the rest of the community according to criteria examined in this study. These programs plus other public and private youth employment programs were inadequate in that many youths in the cities with I-TRY programs and over 1.6 million youths in the United States were unemployed during the summer of 1968 (58, No. 3, p. 5).

LITERATURE CITED

1. Batchhelder, Alan B. The economics of poverty. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1966.

2. Bergstrom, Howard E. Job performance of young workers in relation to school background. Minneapolis, Minn., Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc. 1966.

3. Bogan, Forrest A. Employment of school age youth, October 1965. U.S. Department of Labor Special Labor Force Report No. 68. 1966.

4. Carr, Lowell J. Delinquency control. New York, N.Y., Harper and Brothers, Inc. 1940.

5. Chernick, Jack; Indik, Bernard P.; and Craig, Roger. The selection of trainees under MDTA. New Brunswick, N.J., Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University. ca. 1966.

6. Citizens Study Committee, Davenport, Iowa. A study of human needs and community services of Scott County, Iowa: poverty study. Davenport, Iowa, Author. 1968.

7. Citizens Study Committee, Davenport, Iowa. A study of human needs and community services of Scott County, Iowa: summary. Davenport, Iowa, Author. 1968.

8. Community Improvement, Inc. Annual report. Des Moines, Iowa, Author. March 1969.

9. Community Improvement, Inc. Operation Youth Opportunity, summer-1968: a final report and evaluation. Des Moines, Iowa, Author. 1968.

10. Council of State Governments, President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Juvenile delinquency: a report on state action and responsibilities. Chicago, Illinois, Author. 1962.

11. Crusade for Opportunity in Syracuse and Onodaga County, Inc. Final mimeographed report. Washington, D.C., Division of Special Programs, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor. 1964.

12. The Des Moines Police Department Juvenile Bureau. Annual report for 1968. Mimeo. Des Moines, Iowa, Author. 1969.

13. Duff, Raymond S. and Hollingshead, August B. Sickness and society. New York, N.Y., Harper and Row, Inc. 1968.

14. Eckerman, William C.; Gerstel, Eva K.; and Williams, Richard B. A comprehensive assessment of the problems and characteristics of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees: a pilot investigation. Durham, N.C., Research Triangle Institute. 1969.

15. Fillmore, William S., Jr. Experimental and demonstration residential project of St. Petersburg, (Pinellas) Florida: final report. Mimeo. St. Petersburg, Florida, Author. September 1965.

16. Flanagan, John C. Project talent: the American high school student. Pittsburgh, Project Talent Office, University of Pittsburgh. 1964.

17. Floyd Hunter Co. A training program for out-of-school youth. Final mimeographed report of MDTA experimental and demonstration project. Berkeley, California, Floyd Hunter Company. November 1965.

18. Glazer, Nona Y. and Creedon, Carol F. Children and poverty: some sociological and psychological perspectives. Chicago, Ill., Rand McNally and Company. 1968.

19. Glueck, Sheldon. The problem of delinquency. Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin Company. 1959.

20. Hathaway, Starke R. and Monachesi, Elio D. Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with the MMPI. Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press. 1953.

21. Herman, Melvin and Sadofsky, Stanley. Youth-work programs: problems of planning and operation. New York, Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University. 1966.

22. Hirschi, Travis and Selvin, Hanan C. Delinquency research: an appraisal of analytical methods. New York, N.Y., The Free Press. 1967.

23. Hollingshead, August B. and Redlich, Frederick C. Social class and mental illness. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1958.

24. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. First interim report on research/evaluation component of I-TRY. Ames, Iowa, Author. July 1968.

25. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. Second interim report on research/evaluation component of I-TRY. Ames, Iowa, Author. October 1968.

26. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. Third interim report on research/evaluation component of I-TRY. Ames, Iowa, Author. February 1969.

27. Iowa, State of. Department of Public Instruction. Dropouts: Iowa public schools July 2, 1963--June 30, 1964. Des Moines, Iowa, The State of Iowa. 1965.

28. Lunden, Walter A. Crime and delinquency in Des Moines and Polk County, Iowa 1956 - 1965. (Prepared for Des Moines Police Department and the Polk County Sheriff Staff). Ames, Iowa, Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University. May 1966.

29. Miles, Guy H. Final report on phase I - optimizing the benefits of Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects for rural youths. Minneapolis, Minn., North Star Research and Development Institute. ca. 1967.

30. Miles, Guy H. Report on survey of recent literature relevant to optimizing the benefits of Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects for rural youth. Minneapolis, Minn., North Star Research and Development. ca. 1967.

31. Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of research design and social measurement. New York, David McKay Co., Inc. 1964.

32. Myers, Jerome K. and Bean, Lee L. A decade later: a follow-up social class and mental illness. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1968.

33. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Report. The New York Times Editor. New York, N.Y., Bantam Books, Inc. 1968.

34. The National Committee on Employment of Youth. Summer jobs for youth - 1968: survey of twenty major cities. New York, N.Y., Author. 1968.

35. National Institute of Labor Education. Final report to the Secretary of Labor, U.S. Labor Department on OMAT Project P 3-63. Washington, D.C., Author. July 1965.

36. Nosow, Sigmund. Retraining under the Manpower Development Training Act: a study of attributes of trainees associated with successful retraining. Lansing, Mich., School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University. January 1965.

37. Palomba, Neil A. Evaluation of Iowa Governor's dropout program. Des Moines, Iowa, Iowa Manpower Development Council. ca. 1968.

38. Papaioannou, P. C. and Soults, D. J. ELAFOS reference manual. Iowa State University, Statistical Laboratory, Numerical Analysis-Programming Series, No. 10. August 1967.

39. Perrella, Vera C. Employment of school age youth, October 1966. U.S. Department of Labor, Special Labor Force Report 87. 1967.

40. Peterson, Gertrude D. An evaluation of the concept of trainee camps for unemployed youth. Stanford, Calif., Stanford Research Institute. June 1965.

41. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The challenge of crime in a free society. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. 1967.

42. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task force report: juvenile delinquency and youth crime. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. 1967.

43. The President's Committee on Youth Employment. The challenge of jobless youth. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. April 1963.

44. Radomski, Alexander L. and Mills, Anita U. Family income and related characteristics among low-income counties and states. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Research Report I. 1964.

45. Robin, Gerald D. An assessment of the In-Public School Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects in Cincinnati and Detroit, with special reference to summer only and year-round enrollees. Philadelphia, Pa., National Analysts, Inc. 1969.

46. Robison, Sophia Moses. Can delinquency be measured? New York, N.Y., Columbia Free Press. 1936.

47. Ross, Arthur M. and Hill, Herbert. Employment, race and poverty. New York, N.Y., Harcourt, Brace and World. 1967.

48. Smith, Arthur E.; Collins, Hardin A.; and Meindl, Joseph L. Evaluation and skill training of out-of-school, hard core unemployed youth for training and placement. Saint Louis, Mo., Department of Education, Saint Louis University. 1964-1965.

49. Socknat, James A. Governor Harold E. Hughes and social crisis in Iowa: a study of the exercise of gubernatorial power for human resource development. Ames, Iowa, Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. January 1969.

50. U.S. Census Bureau. 18th Census, 1960. Population, 1, Part 17A. 1960.

51. U.S. Census Bureau. 18th Census, 1960. Population, 1, Part 17B. 1960.

52. U.S. Census Bureau. 18th Census, 1960. Population, 1, Part 17C. 1960.

53. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, March 29, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1402. 1966.

54. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Davenport, Iowa, October 7, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1440. 1966.

55. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Des Moines, Iowa, April 28, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1430. 1966.

56. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Waterloo, Iowa, April 28, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1436. 1966.

57. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Monthly Report 14, No. 10-12. April-June 1968.

58. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Monthly Report 15, No. 1-3. July-September 1968.

59. U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Detroit riot: a profile of 500 prisoners. Washington, D.C., Author. March 1968.

60. U.S. Department of Labor. Manpower report of the President. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing. 1968.

61. U.S. Department of Labor. Oak Glenn-a training camp for unemployed youth. U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Automation Research Monograph No. 5. 1966.

62. U.S. Department of Labor. Young workers: their special training needs. U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Research Bulletin No. 3. May 1963.

63. Waterloo Community Schools. Summary of questionnaires given to Waterloo 1968 Summer Program students. Unpublished report on Waterloo's Metropolitan Improvement Services 1968 Summer employment program. Waterloo, Iowa, Author. November 1968.

64. Wather, Regis H. and Magnusson, Margaret. A retrospective study of the effectiveness of out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs in four urban sites. Washington, D.C., Social Research Group, George Washington University. November 1967.

65. Will, Robert E. and Vatter, Harold G. Poverty in affluence. New York, N.Y., Harcourt, Brace and World. 1965.

66. YMCA Vocational Service Center Project. Final Report of the YMCA Youth and Work Project 1962-1966. Brooklyn, N.Y., Author. April 1966.

67. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. Appendixes to accompany the Project I-TRY Evaluation. Ames, Iowa. 1969.

APPENDIX A

NAME _____ MALE _____ FEMALE _____ AGE _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE _____ SCHOOL _____

BIRTH DATE _____ HEIGHT _____ WEIGHT _____

FATHER WORKS AT _____

MOTHER WORKS AT _____

NUMBER PERSONS LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD _____

TYPE OF WORK WANTED _____

_____

_____

APPLICATION DATE _____

Form 1. Waterloo Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc.

IOWA

65.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION

IOWA STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SERVICE
545 Sixth Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

COMMISSIONERS
J. W. JANSSEN, CHAIRMAN
HENRY E. CARTER
CECIL A. REED

HAROLD E. HUGHES, GOVERNOR

Dear Parent or Guardian:

In order for your young adult to be considered for any of the various summer employment programs we are responsible for, we need the following information from you.

1. Applicant's Name _____
First Middle Initial Last

2. Home Address _____ 3. Telephone Number _____

4. Applicant's Birthdate _____ 5. Social Security Number _____
Month Day Year

6. Number in your family living at home _____.

7. Estimated gross yearly family income from all sources _____.

8. Is your family receiving any public assistance at present _____. If yes, what ____.

9. I (_____) hereby give my consent for (_____)
Parent or Guardian Signature Name of Your Child on this record

to work during the summer of 1968. I understand that the kind of work will be in adherence to the child labor laws as these laws pertain to youth working under eighteen years of age. Further, in signing above, I attest to the truth of facts provided to determine his or her eligibility for summer employment programs.

All work assignments in the summer programs will be on a temporary basis for the summer months only.

In order for your child to be considered for any of the special summer employment programs, we must have this form returned and signed by you. If your child is not considered to eligible for the special summer employment programs, he or she will be considered for any other summer jobs provided by local employers.

We are not able to guarantee that your child will obtain a summer job through either the special summer employment programs or other summer opportunities. All applicants will be selected and referred to job possibilities without regard to any person's race, creed, color, or national origin.

This copy to be returned to the IOWA STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OFFICE - OLD FEDERAL BUILDING - 5th and Court

Form 2. Des Moines Operation Youth Opportunity

Name _____ Social Security Number _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

Address _____ Phone _____
(Number) (Street) (City) (Zip)

Age _____ Birth Date _____ Height _____ Weight _____
(Month) (Day) (Yr.)

Have you ever been arrested? _____

Have you any disabilities _____ Any skills or talents _____

Education: Grammer school _____ yrs. High School _____ Yrs. Other _____

If you have worked before, list the two most recent places of employment, and the name of your immediate supervisor.

_____

EMPLOYER ADDRESS WHEN EMPLOYED THERE

Supervisor's name and title _____

_____

EMPLOYER ADDRESS WHEN EMPLOYED THERE

Supervisor's name and title _____

(over)

Form 3. Cedar Rapids Youth Employment Services

Statistical Information

Number in family	Family Income
1	$1,600
2	2,000
3	2,500
4	3,200
5	3,800
6	4,200
7	4,700
8	5,300
9	5,800
10	6,300
11	6,800
+	Add $500 for each

Family on Welfare Yes_____ No_____

Number in family at home_____ is the family income above or below the amount shown at left opposite the number in family at home_____

Parent or guardian's name_____

Parent or guardian phone_____

Parent or guardian address_____

Your parent or guardian's signature below will indicate your family's agreement to your enrollment in the Youth Employment Service:

Signature_____

Form 3. (Continued)

Chamber of Commerce Offices
404 Main Street

James Lischer, President
Fred DeFayette, Director

Work Application: Date _____

Name of applicant _____ Sex Age
Last First Middle

Address _____

_____ Phone Number _____

Birthdate: ____ ____ ____ Social Security Number _____
Month Day Year

School attending _____ Grade now in _____

If you graduated from high school, give name of school and year graduated:

_____ _____
Name of School granting diploma Year

If you are not now in school or have not graduated, give the name of the school last attended-highest grade completed-and reason for dropping out:

_____ _____ _____
Name of school last attended Grade completed Reason for dropping

Check one:
Prefer part-time work _____
Prefer full-time work _____

Physical condition or limitations: _____

_____

Work skills possessed: _____

_____

_____
Signature of applicant

Return this form to Courthouse - Room 34

.....

Date application accepted _____

Work assignment (place) _____ Phone # _____

Person in charge _____

Additional information:

Dedicated to community improvement by providing jobs, counseling and training for the youth of Scott County

Form 4. Davenport Community Pride, Inc.